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**Introduction**

*Police Occupational Culture: New Debates and Directions*

Megan O’Neill and Anne-Marie Singh


In the fields of police research and reform, there is an inescapable, controversial, surprisingly stubborn and recurring theme: the police occupational culture. It has been a topic of interest since research of the public police began in the 1960s, it has been the focal point of every conceivable variety of literature (from academic to pulp), film (from documentary to farce) and television (from evening news to morning cartoons). The importance of the police presence and its culture has even been linked to the idea of nationhood generally (Loader & Mulcahy 2003). Police culture has been seen as both the object of policing and political reform in developing democracies and a barrier to such reforms. In more established democracies of ‘the west’ police occupational culture has been held up to public scrutiny, as in the 1999 inquiry into the London Metropolitan Police’s handling of the racially-motivated murder of a young black man, Stephen Lawrence (Macpherson 1999). All this makes it a topic of immense interest and importance both within the police and beyond. However, as this book will demonstrate, some of the original texts on police culture still have a considerable influence on the way it continues to be understood, despite the passage of over 40 years and numerous research projects of varying methods and fields of interest, many of which suggest a broader view is needed.

It is not just the passage of time or developing research methods and fields that demands a book such as this. There have been many significant events and changing contexts for police work in the course of the intervening decades and these are reflected in the contributions to this volume. For example, the police, in many countries, now work in a radically different legal environment, with greater demands for police accountability – and not just in the practice of their craft or in their use of force. It also includes their role as employers – their willingness to embrace the diversity of their workforce – as well as their ability to be responsible agents of the state. Other internal issues too are increasingly salient, such as acceptance and enabling of post-secondary education for all ranks of employee. The police now also find themselves with a mandate to work in partnership with a wide spectrum of groups and organisations, from highly organised and multi-national security companies to local individuals or voluntary community security groups. The police can no longer be viewed as an isolated ‘force’, but must become a community ‘service’, whether they welcome such a change or not, and one that is representative of the community it serves. It is very important for policing studies to take stock of the cultural implications of these changes, and to that end we hope this book will be a timely and, so far as its scope permits, a comprehensive analysis of current work on these issues.

In this introduction it seems to us better to defer any definition of ‘police occupational culture’, however much it is of the essence. For each contributor in this volume has her or his own distinctive handle on the phrase and to try to summarise or
consolidate the diversity of interpretation would be a disservice to our authors. Instead, we offer here a primed canvas on which they can paint their own perspectives: that the police occupational culture can best be considered as the ‘way things are done around here’ for the officers, not always ‘by the book’, but not always without it either. Police, both public and private sector, have socially constructed ways of viewing the world, their place in it, and the appropriate action to take in their jobs. These are murky waters indeed, but waters we hope this book will help the reader to navigate.

The purpose of this book is to engage with some of the most recent research on the police occupational culture in order to update and advance the discussions around it. Represented here are not only some of the earliest writers on the topic but also emerging scholars, yielding both reflection on and extension of established discourse and fresh and new perspectives. A key element of this book is the international dimension it brings. Much of the best known work in this field comes from the United States and the United Kingdom. These perspectives are present, but so are those of several countries in Africa as well as Australia and Canada, showing a degree of continuity with the classic research locations, but also interesting points of departure. Organised policing is present in every national state and much insight can be gained into policing culture by looking beyond the typical Anglo-American perspective. Indeed, the book’s Conclusion argues for much more comparative work in police cultural studies.

**Background to Current Police Culture Research**

Before considering in more detail the chapters in this volume, let us look briefly at some of the work that continues to exert a powerful influence on police culture research. The earlier works (such as Westley, Rubenstein, Skolnick and Bittner) were groundbreaking in that a previously unresearched organisation became a new site of academic interest. The police organisation did not necessarily open its doors to all academic researchers, but the few who were able to negotiate access provided a rich account of a powerful group in western democratic society. These initial ethnographies and other studies may portray a police service that no longer exists in exactly the same form, but they have provided inspiration and insight to police culture researchers all over the world, and are still widely cited, both for their valuable insights and, in some cases, for their now usefully recognized shortcomings. The following brief look at prominent writers from the 1970s onwards (some of whom are contributors to this book and who continue to develop and expand their contribution to the field) is offered not as a comprehensive list but to indicate some of the key lines of debate.

One of the earliest police researchers was William Westley (1970). He conducted his research in the United States in the 1950s, although it was not published until the 1970s. He describes a police force that perceives a very hostile public. Officers usually only meet the policed, rather then the ones they are protecting, and as such it is easy to see why the public comes to be seen as a threat. This then leads the police to bind together in isolation and secrecy for self-protection. This isolation and secrecy is ‘an occupational directive, a rule of thumb, the sustenance and the core of meanings. From it the definitions flow and conduct is regulated for the general and the particular’ (Westley 1970, p. 49). His work was influential in its time but it has since been criticised for oversimplifying police relations with the public (Holdaway 1989, p. 70). It makes no allowance for non-hostile police encounters with the public.
to enter police thinking. It also presents a monolithic view of the police occupational culture, assumed to apply generally to all Anglo-American police groups.

Rubenstein, in his study of an inner city area in the USA (1973, pp. 435-436), picks up this theme of isolation, though he does not attribute it to a perceived public hostility; he sees the police as isolated because of the nature of their work. Not only do they often work alone, but also due to their hours and the issues they have to face they tend to be friends only with other police officers. He also finds pervasive secrecy in the force, but unlike Westley who saw the police group as secretive towards outsiders (1970, p. 141), Rubenstein sees individual officers as being secretive towards everyone else, including other officers. For him, ‘a policeman’s\(^1\) information is his private stock, which nobody else may presume to make claims on, unless invited to share’ (1973, p. 439). In this way, officers protect the work they have done so that no one else can claim rights to it and if they are involved in illegal activities no else can be implicated.

Skolnick (1966), another American researcher, has proposed the idea of a police ‘working personality’, which is generated by a combination of three elements of police work: danger, authority and efficiency. He acknowledges that not all police officers are alike in this personality, but that it is reflective of distinct cognitive tendencies in the police as an occupational group. The elements of danger and authority isolate police officers. Because their work is unpredictable when it comes to the potential for danger, police officers tend to be suspicious of everyone and this can be socially isolating. Their authority requires them to enforce laws of ‘puritanical morality’ that they could never hope to adhere to themselves, making them seem hypocritical and inviting hostility towards them from the public. All this inclines them to be more socially isolated and thus encourages solidarity with each other (Skolnick 1966, pp. 42-44), as Westley suggested. But what makes Skolnick’s ‘working personality’ thesis unique is his added element of the pressure on police to produce, to appear efficient. The demand both internally and from the public that officers maintain order and make arrests, coupled with danger and authority mean that official procedure and the law may be modified or even set aside so that the desired end result is achieved. Skolnick argues that the police want to appear to be competent craftsmen, and so do the best they can through the pressures they face (Skolnick 1966, pp. 110-111). Reiner (2000, pp. 87-88) cites Skolnick’s work as the ‘locus classicus’ for studying the police culture, but adds that it neglected to consider how this model may vary within and between forces or to take account of the relationship between the police and the wider social and political structure (Westley is also open to these criticisms). Reiner argues that the police reflect and influence power differences in society and he feels that Skolnick could have taken heed of this.

In his now classic study in the USA, Bittner (1967) describes how uniformed officers on ‘skid-row’ keep the peace. Building on the work of Banton (1964), who argued that police are more ‘peace officers’ than ‘law enforcement officers’, Bittner notes how, rather than enforcing the law as an end in itself, skid-row officers will invoke the law only if it will lead to a more tranquil environment. They use their powers strategically; they get to know their beat and the people in it and they learn what is the best way to respond to any situation. Bittner’s study makes the case that the two police tasks of law enforcement and peacekeeping go hand in hand and cannot be regarded separately. However, it could be argued that in practice this is an overly simplistic analysis of police work, especially for present-day officers whose duties are

---

\(^1\) The obvious gendering of the earlier police research will be explored later in this introduction.
multifarious. Wright for example (2002), proposes four overlapping police ‘modes’: peacekeeping, crime investigation, management of risk and community justice.

The scholars who have made significant contributions to this field are not just Americans or men. The next author of note, Maureen Cain, is a British researcher who conducted groundbreaking work into police culture in the 1970s. Hers is one of the first examinations of the differences within police culture. Cain (1971) compared urban and rural police forces and found marked differences in their experiences. For instance, both types of officers developed coping techniques (easing behaviour) for their long periods of boredom, but the nature of these techniques would vary depending on the type of area the police officer patrolled. She also found differences between the urban and rural officers in how they approached members of the public. Thus while some aspects of police culture were similar, their actual expression will vary depending on context, and this is a theme that will be taken further in many of the chapters in this book as authors consider police culture in a variety of countries and contexts.

The 1980s saw the publication of a major piece of British research into the workings of the public police, specifically the London Metropolitan Police. Smith and Grey’s (1985) report for the Policy Studies Institute brought to light and openly criticised many expressions and characterisations of police culture. This groundbreaking study is still cited for its detailed analysis of police officers in their working practices, highlighting numerous aspects not so far touched upon in previous research. For example, Smith and Grey draw attention to the largely explicit and accepted racist language of the officers they were observing, concluding, nonetheless, that these same officers did not act in a racist way when carrying out their duties. This is a similar argument to that of Waddington (1999), that ‘canteen’ talk is not indicative of actual police action.

One key British writer who might disagree with this assumption is an author in this volume, Simon Holdaway. Holdaway began his research into police culture as a serving officer in the 1970s. He has published many works on the experiences of minority ethnic police officers and the ‘racialisation’ of policing (Holdaway 1996). The racialisation process suggests that routine and mundane police work and relationships can take on a racial ‘framing’ that need not be there. People and events can be seen in a way that prioritises race (or, ignores race when it is actually pertinent), and in consequence police officers can inadvertently act in racist ways without completely realising it if that is how their ‘usual’ practice has always been. In this assessment, regarding police talk as easily separable from and thus not representative of police action is too simplistic. Holdaway’s work on race and ethnicity in police work and police culture continues to be highly influential (see, for example, Rowe 2004).

Another prominent writer in the police culture genre who is a contributor to this book is Peter K. Manning. Manning’s work in the 1970s and 1980s on uniformed police officers (in the US and the UK) and detectives (in the US) remain core texts for any police culture researcher (see, for example, Manning 1980 and 1997). He has conducted ethnographies in several police forces, and through them has made contributions to many areas of sociological thought, such as dramaturgy and semiotics. Manning continues to be a prolific writer in this field, more recently in the areas of technology in policing and democratic policing approaches. His works portray the symbolism and meaning inherent in police action, an approach taken up by writers such as Loader and Mulcahy (2003).
It is not just Britain and the US that have served as sites for the ‘classic’ police culture research. Maurice Punch found fruitful scholarly opportunities in the Netherlands. His work began in the 1970s and continues to this day, as exemplified by his chapter in this volume. Punch has written extensively about his observations on the beat with Dutch police, providing a detailed account of their working practices, both above-board and otherwise. Much of his work focuses on police corruption and the internal reactions to it (1985). Being a British writer in the Netherlands allowed Punch to bring a new international dimension to the Anglo-American dominated police culture field. His emphasis on the inherent (and inextricable) social service aspect of police work (1979) is one that has subsequently been taken up by many other writers.

One final writer (and author in this book) who deserves note in this overview also brings a much-needed international dimension. Janet Chan, who began her work in the 1980s, conducting research in Canada and Australia, has made a particularly deep impression on the police culture field. She argues that police culture cannot be fully appreciated without consideration of the wider social context in which it is located and the agency of the individual officers (1997). Chan challenges the orthodox characterisations of police culture with a call for a more specific (perhaps inductive) approach where the particularities of police dispositions and the power relations and social relations that frame these are investigated preferably through a more case-study approach and using ethnographic methods. Her influence can be felt throughout this book in which many of the authors draw upon it for inspiration, and her attention to variety in police culture both between and within police forces is a notably recurring issue in the chapters that follow.

There are many other writers on police culture that we could mention here (such as Muir, Fielding, Reuss-Ianni, Reiner, Heidensohn, Norris, Maguire, and more) and their omission reflects only the exigencies of space. What we do hope to have shown is that while writings on the police did not start out with an idea of ‘culture’, over time one began to emerge, often focussed on characteristics like secrecy, suspicion, isolation, racism, sexism and informal working practices. In turn, subsequent writers begin to question the concept, with the improbability if its being universally generalisable in all societies and across time. But one very notable omission from the main thrust of the work we have been surveying is a consideration of the growing private security and private policing market and any occupational culture there. Nor is it only the commercial sector that has muscled in on the state’s claimed monopoly on policing and the use of force: at the local level, voluntary community-based structures actively perform policing functions, sometimes in co-operation with the public police (i.e. Neighbourhood Watch) and sometimes quite independently of them (i.e. Guardian Angels). Consideration needs to be given to these voluntary groups’ cultures, and how they compare to those of the public police. The chapters that follow will begin to unravel the factors that construct police culture – public-sector, private and voluntary, in a variety of sites, with a variety of actors – to provide a more rounded analysis of police culture.

**New Debates and Directions in Research**

The book is structured in terms of four broad themes. The first examines the key analytical concept ‘police occupational culture’. Chapters by Sklansky, Manning, and Cockcroft each offer a critical assessment of the traditional interpretation of police culture as a homogeneous and homogenising phenomenon. The second theme, developed in the Punch, Chan, Bevir and Krupicka, and Brown chapters, focuses on
the impact, on the occupational culture, of various police organisational reforms. The third theme, pursued in the chapters by Marks, O’Neill and Holdaway, and Wood and Marks, investigates how police occupational culture is created, given meaning, shaped and transformed ‘from below’, through the agency, actions and activities of police unions, associations and individual officers. The final theme, explored in two chapters by Singh and Kempa, and Baker, concerns new policing cultures in the contemporary plural field of security governance.

Part I: Deconstructing the notion of police occupational culture

David Sklansky (Chapter 1) revisits the meaning of ‘police occupational culture’ in light of contemporary developments in policing. Lawyers, scholars, and police reformers in the United States, he notes, have long assumed that police officers share a monolithic occupational mindset, and that this mindset—paranoid, insular, intolerant, and inflexible—is the chief impediment to better law enforcement. What he terms the ‘Police Subculture Schema’ helped shaped American police reform by supporting the top-down control mechanisms of police professionalism, the judicial oversight model at the centre of the Supreme Court’s ‘criminal procedure revolution’, and systems of civilian oversight. But while this ‘Police Subculture Schema’ made a good deal of sense in the 1950s, 1960s and early 1970s, he argues that it makes less sense today. According to Sklansky, increasingly the idea of a monolithic, reactionary police subculture hinders clear thinking about the police, by obscuring differences between officers, new complexities of police identity, and dynamic processes within the police workforce. It diverts attention from important avenues of reform. Sklansky points to neglected questions pertaining to institutional redesign of police agencies, the characteristics of effective, trustworthy police and the participatory decision-making of rank-and-file officers. The ‘Police Subculture Schema’ also directs focus away from new, emerging challenges in policing such as the growth of police managerialism and the risk that diversification of police agencies is stalling if not backsliding.

Like Sklansky, Peter Manning (Chapter 2) offers a robust critique of the traditional model of police occupational culture, a model that owes much to the work of William Westley. For Manning, that model, as a benchmark for all matters police, has become an unwelcome filter that precludes deeper analyses of policing as an organization and as a practice. This has come about because the visible and obvious aspect of policing, the officer’s culture, is too easily taken as globally indicative of the organization and its politics, the mandate, and intra- and inter-organizational dynamics. Manning protests at the way research has seized on police-citizen interactions, a single aspect of public policing, as fundamental to an understanding of policing as an activity. In addition, he suggests that ‘the dramaturgical properties of “profiling” and a resentful negative force make it an easy intaglio on which textbook writers can further inscribe”. This has made the analysis of policing superficial and misleadingly reductionistic, stripping the organization of its politics and nuance and its larger field of municipal and local politics, along with its inter-organizational dynamics. It is unwarrantable, Manning demonstrates, that the small-scale sketch provided by Westley should now stand as a synecdoche for the entire organization and its practices and politics.

Manning reviews literature relevant to understanding the occupational culture of policing (considered as segments – officers, middle management/supervision and top command – not sub-cultures) and argues for recognition of complexity in the use of the concept. He insists that the police occupation must be located within its
organisational context: its ecology (spatial and temporal elements), material constraints, patterned interactions and shared understandings. He also points to the necessity of investigating inter- and intra-organizational relationships for better understanding of the role of the top command and staff in organizational governance. He provides details from a case study of two examples of policing mass public occasions in Boston in 2004 to illustrate his argument.

Tom Cockcroft (Chapter 3) reflects on the utility of oral history for rethinking police culture and identifies some of the attendant definitional, methodological and analytical issues. Oral history studies of the police rely on narrative accounts by retired officers of their past (including recent past) experiences. Based on a review of the extant research, Cockcroft argues that the oral history approach challenges us to differentiate between police organizational influences and the influences of wider society. This emphasises both the complex linkages between police officers at the organisational level and the complicated relations that exist between the police and the wider social environment in which they are necessarily located and function. This approach, Cockcroft maintains, also highlights the difficulties associated with assuming a degree of universality between police cultures. Drawing on Janet Chan’s work, he notes the failure of conventional analyses to examine variations in police occupational culture. The oral history method, he argues, gives voice to the organisational, social and historical contexts of policing and attends to differences in police role, behaviours and values within and between jurisdictions and over time. The oral history approach also encourages a close look at the tricky relationship between language and behaviour that Waddington and others have pointed to, by exploring the disparity between police narration (what is said) and police action (what actually happened).

**Part II: Police reform, cultural change and continuity**

Having critiqued the concept of police culture, the book now turns to an analysis of the cultural implications of police reform projects. Maurice Punch (Chapter 4) provides an analysis of organisational reform efforts to transform the police into a ‘professional’ institution with well-educated leaders. He outlines how the British Police began in 1829 as an ‘artisan’ institution that would develop its own leaders and not recruit the ‘educated’. Senior officers (and also police constables) tended to be ‘respectable’ upper working class males with limited formal education. However, by the 1960s pressure for change led to support for university education for officers. The Essex Police, in an experiment partly aimed at preventing the imposition of leaders from outside of the police organisation, sent officers to university to learn about society through both formal study for a social science degree and informal interaction with a diversity of fellow students. Punch draws on oral history material involving interviews with officers who studied in that period, examining their experiences as students, their return to policing and their reflections on having graduates within the service. These officers’ experience in attending tertiary education institutions and then returning to the police organisation points to some of the changes that emerged within police occupational culture and within police leadership styles from as early as the 1960s.

Punch argues that educating officers at university has contributed substantially and positively to the police organisation and its culture, particularly through fostering a more analytical approach to understanding practical problems and developing solutions. These early experiments to improve officers’ educational qualifications are now far more common and a series of formalized relationships have now been
established between universities and the police in the United Kingdom, but also in other parts of the world like Australia. Punch warns, though, that some of these positive effects may be limited or even contradicted by other factors in recent reforms such as ‘new public management’ and the ‘professionalising’ of policing.

Janet Chan (Chapter 5) examines the relationship between police stress and occupational culture, an under-researched area. She notes that danger and trauma in police work have long been linked to the development of a suspicious and cynical ‘street cop’ culture. Nevertheless, there is evidence, she contends, that stress among police officers in Western democracies is more likely to be produced by organisational pressure and management practices than by actual traumatic experience. The chapter uses data from a follow-up study of police recruits in New South Wales, Australia to consider the impact of organisational changes on police officers’ perception of their work and culture. Chan demonstrates the way changes in the field of policing had generated organisational stressors – i.e. increased accountability, competitive promotion systems – that had modified some aspects of the occupational habitus while reinforcing others. She argues that police reforms and organisational changes may have further embedded certain negative aspects of police culture such as cynicism and self-protection even while putting an end to other negative features such as the ‘code of silence’.

Mark Bevir and Ben Krupicka (Chapter 6) attempt to understand police reform in the United Kingdom and United States during the latter half of the twentieth century by exploring the various narratives that have inspired it. They indicate that many of these narratives are elite ones and bear similarities to wider public sector reform narratives. They identify and describe three distinct and competing sets of elite beliefs: a progressive narrative tied to bureaucratic modes of governance; a neo-liberal narrative emphasising markets and new management practices; and a community policing narrative promoting partnerships and networks. While policy experts and public officials formulate narratives, the reforms are implemented and enacted in part by local police officers. Bevir and Krupicka point out that rank-and-file officers will necessarily interpret and extend the elite-inspired reforms through the lenses of their own local beliefs. According to the authors, the inability of the elite narratives to adequately recognize the impact of local cultures means that the reforms are often incomplete and give rise to unintended consequences. They suggest that a better understanding of this process of reform and its implications for democratic governance might orientate reformers and scholars toward more bottom-up approaches to police reform (a point more fully explored in Part III of the book).

Bethan Loftus’s ethnographic study (Chapter 7) of a provincial English police force exposes a contradiction that emerged between the new police organisational emphasis on diversity and the enduring axes of class. Loftus notes that efforts aimed at changing police culture both within and beyond the organisation focus on notions of equity, anti-discrimination, and respect for diversities of race, gender and sexuality. On the other hand it was predominantly poor and low status white males who occupied a central position in the police’s practical workload and in their occupational consciousness. She demonstrates that contempt expressed towards the under-class constitutes a prominent yet relatively unexamined aspect of police culture: police officers often saw themselves as protecting the moral majority from the morally worthless underclass; this accentuated their sense of solidarity and their moral conservatism and also marked out a ‘common enemy’. She observes that class contempt goes largely unchallenged in contemporary police institutions, and that this confirms the status of poor white males in particular as legitimate targets of contempt
and more generally reinforces societal disregard for its poor. Thus reform efforts missed a large aspect of police practice; they were intended to be holistic but were interpreted thematically.

In some contrast to Loftus, Jennifer Brown (Chapter 8) argues that it is gender that has been eclipsed by demands of other diversity agendas: the recent urgency in tackling racist language did not extend to sexist or homophobic language and behaviour. Brown proposes that whilst operational policing and its management may have changed, the masculine ethos of police officers has not. She notes that the introduction of equality legislation, new managerialism in the public sector, and initiatives in community policing presaged a potential transformation of policing through adoption of more co-operative and collaborative styles that might be held to be more feminine in orientation. Yet her review of recent research shows that organisational attention to gender issues has slipped and she claims that police occupational identity remains privileged by a masculine orientation which values danger, excitement and ‘good arrests’. She examines why this is so and concludes that male officers, finding their identity under threat from a raft of managerial and operational reforms, deploy ritual arguments to preserve gender continuity, distinctiveness, self-esteem and self-efficiency. A similar process is hypothesised for police organisations facing adverse conditions more generally.

Part III: Police as Change Agents
Change in police culture does not just happen from above. Officers and staff themselves can instigate change in the culture or be directly involved in change projects. Monique Marks (Chapter 9) highlights the possibility of effecting police reform ‘from below’ in her discussion of cultural influences of police unions, a little researched area. As a subcultural grouping, police unions exhibit specific characteristics and identities while sharing the core values of the dominant organisational culture. Drawing on first-hand empirical data from Canada, the US, Australia, New Zealand and South Africa, Marks shows that adherence to traditional cultural norms structures union responses to the organisational reform initiatives of police leaders and managers. But she suggests that there is evidence of police unions that break from cultural traditions and that potential exists for unions to play an important role in directing more responsive and forward thinking reform agendas, including ways of repositioning the police, as providers of public goods, in policing networks.

Marks points out that in some countries, such as South Africa, police unions have promoted more democratic policing practices through their identification with a range of social justice organisations. She concludes that police unions, as important insider groupings, have the capacity to reshape police culture in new, progressive directions. But she argues that this role as change agents is dependent on police unions broadening their understandings of police professionalism and on their willingness to forge new identities and alliances.

Megan O’Neill and Simon Holdaway (Chapter 10) undertake a parallel assessment of the impact of identity-based police associations on the occupational culture. They argue that in recent years, Black Police Associations (BPAs) have become key forces of change within police services throughout the UK. These are voluntary groups composed of minority ethnic police officers and support staff. O’Neill and Holdaway observe that the majority of police services in England and Wales now have an officially recognised BPA. Using data from their recent research project on BPAs, O’Neill and Holdaway examine issues of ethnicity and
diversity in police work. They explore issues such as the decreasing importance of rank and grading in the police culture, whether a parallel, ‘black’ occupational culture is emerging alongside the traditional ‘white’ one, and the interplay between changing individuals and changing the institution as a whole. The authors argue that the impact of BPAs on the police occupational culture occurs within the context of wider ‘field’ events and situations and in individual encounters between minority ethnic police officers and their white colleagues. In contrast to the findings of previous research on minority ethnic police officers, this study suggests that ethnicity plays a central role in their self-identities as police officers.

Much more than in the two previous chapters, police officers in Jennifer Wood and Monique Marks’ study (Chapter 11) appear as innovators, playing an active role in reshaping their work practices and in generating (not simply implementing) change programmes. Wood and Marks propose that cultural transformation is not cataclysmic but occurs through small shifts in the way police practitioners think and act within the context of a constantly changing and plural field of policing. Police officers do not simply acquire new knowledge but must become knowledge producers and brokers. In this respect the authors discuss the ‘Nexus Policing Project’, a joint venture of the Victoria Police and the Australian National University. Wood and Marks attend to the emphasis that Nexus places on mobilising and enhancing the capacity of individual police members to be self-reflective and to respond innovatively to new problems. Police officers who participate in Nexus are provided with the space both to review their existing ways of seeing, being and doing and to engage with other groups (academics, schoolchildren, etc.) whose worldviews and problem-solving approaches may be quite different. While Nexus has been successful, Wood and Marks identify and elaborate some of the challenges associated with police-academic partnerships.

**Part IV: New policing cultures in a plural policing field**

It is of course not just public bodies who undertake policing, and these other groups deserve consideration of their own occupational cultures. Anne-Marie Singh and Michael Kempa (Chapter 12) address similarities between public and private police cultures with particular attention to post-apartheid South Africa. They describe the co-existence and inter-penetration of state and non-state policing agencies in the contemporary security landscape. The authors observe that there is no function performed by the public police that is not also performed, in some manner, by private security agents. However, the cultures of private policing agents have been far less studied than those of public police officers. With the private security industry employing a wide array of coercive techniques and in many cases operating punitive strategies for controlling crime and maintaining public order, this chapter suggests that sectors of this industry exhibit a reactive and punitive organisational culture resembling the dominant culture of the public police in the mid-20th Century. Singh and Kempa focus upon the relevance for private policing cultures of issues and themes traditionally raised in analyses of public police cultures. In particular, they discuss the relevance of concerns pertaining to individual psychology, institutional structure and broader ‘field’ influences for analysing, accounting for and thereby reforming private policing cultures. The authors conclude by raising some questions about what the surprising culture and practices of the private security industry may signal about the emergent political economy of human security. In so doing, they
point to the need to go beyond the traditional binary division between public police and private security cultures.

That policing is not the sole prerogative of the public police is also central to Bruce Baker’s study (Chapter 13). He investigates the role of non-police security agencies and their relationship with the state police in contemporary Uganda, Rwanda and Sierra Leone. Relying on primary interview material, he compares the everyday practices and values of the public police in these three African countries arguing that police culture is shaped by its socio-political context, particularly recent experiences of civil war. Following successful rebellion, Uganda and Rwanda chose to rely on a form of local popular justice, supplemented by the police. Sierra Leone, where the rebellion was defeated, has adopted a more western-style police model of a professionalised force with a monopoly on policing functions. All three have, with substantial international assistance, undertaken management reform to restructure mechanisms of state policing. Baker notes that donor programs focus on training senior personnel in strategic and operational planning aimed at improving accountability, co-ordination, efficiency, effectiveness and community/police relations. He observes that the new values and approaches have differentially penetrated the senior, middle and lower ranks. Baker suggests this divergence of cultures, along with the disparity between the discourses and actual practices of state policing pose problems for the reform efforts of government, police leaders, international donors and foreign police trainers.

Collectively, these chapters map out new lines of debate and directions for research on police occupational culture. A concept that began life as a largely negative, inflexible and monolithic construct has become one that is multi-faceted and intricate. This is indeed a vibrant and exciting field and one that is amenable to diverse methodological and conceptual tools. By opening up the terms of the debate, this book seeks to stimulate further research and discussion. In the concluding chapter we explore the key challenges to police cultural studies and point to possible future areas of research.
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